

R E M A R K S

Claims 13 through 37 are in the application, with Claims 13, 15, 16, 21, 22 and 24-31 having been amended, with Claims 1-12, 14 and 23 having been cancelled, and with Claims 32-37 having been added. Claims 13, 22 and 31 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-12 and 22-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly reciting non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-12 have been cancelled and the rejection thereof is deemed moot.

In view of the Examination Guidelines for Computer-related Inventions, M.P.E.P. §2106, Claims 22-30 have been amended to recite “A computer-readable medium storing processor-executable process steps”. As noted in the section IV.B.1. of the Guidelines:

“[w]hen functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.”

Applicants submit that the amended preamble of Claims 22-30 satisfies the foregoing and therefore falls squarely within the boundaries of statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of the §101 rejection with respect to Claims 22-30 is respectfully requested. If the rejection is maintained despite the foregoing, Applicants request citation of any rule or statute prohibiting the patentability of “a form of energy”. In this regard, applicants note that any object having mass is itself “a form of energy” (i.e., $\text{Energy} = \text{Mass}(c^2)$).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0103090 (Kelley). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Amended independent Claim 13 relates to presentation of a plurality of selectable corporate entities and a plurality of selectable elements, wherein a first one of the plurality of corporate entities is organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from the second one of the plurality of entities. A selection of the second corporate entity is received, and a selection of one of the plurality of selectable elements is received. Information corresponding to the one selected element and relating to the selected second corporate entity is then determined, and the determined information is presented to a user.

As an example of some embodiments of the foregoing, FIG. 19 of the present application illustrates the presentation of a plurality of selectable corporate entities in entity selection area 1910, and of a plurality of selectable elements in links “General”, “Legal”, “Contacts”, “Owners”, “Regulators”, “Officers”, “Jurisdictions”, “Reporting”, “Controllers”, “Funds” and “Maintenance”. The corporate entity “Holding Company” is organizationally upstream from the corporate entity “Held Company”. Moreover, the corporate entity “Holding Company” is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the corporate entity “Held Company”.

FIG. 19 further illustrates selection of the corporate entity “Held Company”, and a selection of the selectable element “General”. Accordingly, information corresponding to the selected element “General” and relating to the selected corporate entity “Held Company” is determined, and main area 1920 presents the determined information to a user. Embodiments are not limited to the depiction of FIG. 19.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of amended independent Claim 1. The art of record is not seen to disclose or suggest at least presentation of a plurality of selectable corporate entities, wherein a first one of the plurality of corporate entities is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from a second one of the plurality of entities. The art of record is also not seen to disclose or suggest at least determination of information corresponding to the selected element and relating to the second corporate entity and presentation of the determined information to a user.

Kelley describes a user interface including context pane 32 and content pane 33. As further described at paragraph [0085], “[t]he context pane (32) contains an expandable and collapsible list of “object” of interest according to the user’s profile.” The list of objects may include company names, products, financial instruments, etc. See [0085].

Content pane 33 includes multiple workspaces for showing the results of action modules. See [0086]. The action modules may perform functions such as (a) retrieving and formatting press releases from company web sites, (b) retrieving current quotes, (c) retrieving, charting and analyzing historical data, (d) retrieving analyst commentaries, and (e) performing a general search using a list of keywords related to an object. See [0077] – [0081].

FIGS. 6-8 of Kelley show expansion of the “Equities” and “Foreign Exchange” headings of context pane 32. Even if the expanded headings result in the presentation of selectable corporate entities within pane 32, which is not conceded, none of the presented corporate entities is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from any other one of the presented corporate entities.

Accordingly, Kelley also fails to disclose or to suggest receiving a selection of a second corporate entity that is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from a first corporate entity. It follows that the applied reference does not disclose or suggest determination and presentation of information corresponding to a selected element and relating to the selected second corporate entity.

Amended independent Claim 1 is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent Claims 13 and 22 relate to a computer-readable medium and an apparatus and include features roughly corresponding to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, amended independent Claims 13 and 22 are also believed to be allowable.

C O N C L U S I O N

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding each of the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed herein because they are not related to the rejections of the independent claims. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0049.

Respectfully submitted,

August 23, 2007
Date

/Nandu A. Talwalkar/
Nandu A. Talwalkar
Registration No. 41,339
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0049